



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,427	08/06/2003	Keith Goldstein	B0651.70012US00 (REH)	7341
23628	7590	06/30/2005		EXAMINER
				TRAIL, ALLYSON NEEL
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2876

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/635,427	GOLDSTEIN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Allyson N. Trail	2876	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 06 August 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-10, 12-24, 26-32, 37-44, 46-52 and 54-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ranard et al (2004/0065729) in view of Zhu et al (2002/0179708).

Ranard et al teaches the following in regards to claims 1-3, 6, 7, 18-21, 37-39, 41, 48, and 54-56:

"Methods and systems are provided for producing transaction cards. A reference number is assigned to each of the cards, which are fabricated in accordance with a specification." (Abstract).

"After fabrication, the reference number assigned to each of the cards is compared with a database to identify any duplication." (Abstract).

"This application relates generally to the field of transaction cards. More specifically, this application relates to methods and systems for the production of transaction cards." (Paragraph 0002).

"Embodiments of the invention provide a method and system for the production of transaction cards that provides improved monitoring capabilities. This is true not only during the production of the transaction cards themselves, but also after production has

been completed. First, a unique reference number is assigned to every card that is produced. This number may be different from the card number printed on the card, but may not be repeated for any card, including cards that may be produced on behalf of other card issuers. After production of a card, the number assigned to the card is compared against a database of previously assigned numbers to ensure that there has been no duplication. If there has been duplication, an audit process is available to identify relevant steps in the production of the specific card and the identity of each individual involved in its production. The use of such an audit process may permit improvements in the production system to avoid future duplicate reference-number assignments. The audit process is also useful for other purposes; for example, when a card is missing, the audit process may be used to identify every individual involved in its production and thereby more easily determine the cause of the loss." (Paragraph 0005).

In regards to claims 54 and 56, the transaction cards include multiple identifiers. One identifier is the identification number used to sort the cards into sleeves and boxes. Ranard et al teaches that the transaction card may be a credit or debit card, "There are a variety of different types of transaction cards currently available for use by consumers, including credit cards, debit cards, stored-value cards, and the like." (Paragraph 0003). Credit cards include multiple identifiers such as the account number and the magnetic strip containing specific card information.

Ranard et al teaches the following in regards to claims 4, 12, 26, 46, and 52:

“Other machines that may be used in the process include a packager 228 to insert and wrap the cards in the sleeves and a labeler 232 to print and affix the identification label to the sleeves.” (Paragraph 0020). The identification label is not affixed to the sleeve unless all of the identifiers match a stored list of identifiers therefore the label suffices as a printed form indicating that the transaction cards in the set all have identifiers matching a stored list of identifiers.

Ranard et al teaches the following in regards to claim 5:

“As the cards are produced, they are cased in a sleeve at block 120. Generally, a sleeve is capable of holding 100-500 transaction cards. A label is affixed to the sleeve at block 124 to identify the cards in the sleeve. At block 128, a post-production check is performed of the transaction cards in the sleeve to determine whether there has been any duplication of card numbers.” (Paragraph 0019).

Ranard et al teaches the following in regards to claims 8-10, 22-24, 42-44:

“This interface provides a mechanism by which the operator may monitor the functioning of the system to initiate the process, modify the process parameters as necessary, and stop the processing when complete. In one embodiment, the operator interface is a screen-based interface in which screens are presented to the operator summarizing the status of processing the transaction cards. The operator may take an active role in the post-production duplication check.” (Paragraph 0021).

“In addition, subprograms may be provided for starting, stopping, restarting, pausing, and otherwise controlling execution of the production process.” (Paragraph 0029).

Ranard et al teaches the following in regards to claims 13, 17, 27, 31, 32, 47, and 51:

“The sleeve is aged in a case at block 132; the case may be labeled as indicated at block 134 and shipped to the card issuer at block 136.” (Paragraph 0019).

Ranard et al teaches the following in regards to claims 14, 28, and 40:

“A record of the duplicate is also retained on the storage device 250 at block 440 for subsequent audit purposes.” (Paragraph 0033).

Ranard et al teaches the following in regards to claims 15, 16, 29, 30, 49, and 50:

“Each sleeve within the case 348 is identified with a sleeve number 343, and information is provided to indicate the status 342 of the sleeve, the number of cards 344 in the sleeve, and beginning 345 and ending 346 reference numbers for the sleeve.” (Paragraph 0027).

Ranard et al’s teachings above fail to specifically teach a card transport that moves transaction cards relative to the card reader.

Figure 3 shows a high-speed package conveyor system 300 having a conveyor belt 300 and laser scanning bar code symbol reading subsystem (101 through 117) for scanning bar codes on packages transported therethrough independent of the package or bar code orientation. The system includes a package velocity and length measurement subsystem 400; a package-in-the-tunnel indication subsystem 500 realized as a 2-D light sensing structure mounted along the conveyor belt, on the input side of the tunnel, for automatically detecting the presence of each package moving into the scanning tunnel.

In view of Zhu et al's teachings it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use apply the transport method for moving packages relative to the reader as taught by Zhu et al to the transaction card system taught by Ranard et al. Ranard et al teaches reading each transaction card in order to determine that there are no duplicate or missing cards. One would be motivated to have a transport for moving the cards toward the card reader in order to speed up the process of reading each individual transaction card.

3. Claims 11, 25, and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ranard et al (2004/0065729) in combination with Zhu et al (2002/0179708) and in further view of Kiekhaefer (6,510,993).

Ranard et al's teachings in combination with the teachings of Zhu et al are discussed above. The combination however fails to teach a transaction card counter.

Kiekhaefer teaches the following in regards to claims 11, 25, and 45:

"By way of background, automated card processing systems are used to process (e.g., count, sort, etc.) large numbers of financial transaction cards, thus saving the time and expense required to process such cards by non-automated methods. One use of equipment of this type is to determine the number of individual cards present in a given set or batch of cards. For example, financial transaction card manufacturers need to be able to automatically count the number of cards produced during a production run of cards for a particular customer or for a particular card type. By way of further example, financial transaction card customers, such as banks, typically count their cards on a regular basis (e.g., daily) for security reasons." (Col. 1 lines, 22-34).

In view of Kiekhaefer's teachings it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a transaction card counter as disclosed by Kiekhaefer along with the transaction fabrication system taught by Ranard et al's in combination with Zhu et al. As discussed by Kiekhaifer, one would be motivated to use a counter for security purposes. Knowing the amount of cards is necessary in order to keep track of each card and to know it's location.

4. Claims 33 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ranard et al (2004/0065729) in combination with Zhu et al (2002/0179708) and in further view of Ramsey (5,590,779).

Ranard et al's teachings in combination with the teachings of Zhu et al are discussed above. The combination however fails to teach a tamper-evident seal for the container holding the transaction cards.

Ramsey teaches the following in regards to claims 33 and 53:

"A tamper-evident packaging system for shipping and viewing valuable items."  
(Abstract).

In view of Ramsey's teachings it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the tamper-proof packaging as taught by Ramsey along with the transaction fabrication system taught by Ranard et al's in combination with Zhu et al. Ranard et al teaches packaging and shipping the transaction cards to retailers. Transaction cards must be kept secure. One would be motivated to use a tamper-evident packaging for shipping the transaction cards in order to prevent theft or tampering.

5. Claims 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goade, SR. (2004/0084536) in view of Borg (4,818,238).

Goade, SR teaches the following in regards to claims 34-36:

"A transaction card sheet product having a plurality of transaction card assemblies. Non-variable data is printed on selected portions of a sheet of material. A strip of removable tape is applied to the sheet of material, and variable data is printed on selected portions of the sheet of material and the strip of tape. The sheet of material is laminated with a transparent material. The laminated sheet of material is cut to define the plurality of transaction card assemblies such that each transaction card assembly includes an information card having variable and non-variable data printed thereon and a corresponding tape receiving portion attached to the information card and having a strip of removable tape attached thereto with variable data printed thereon which corresponds to the variable data printed on the information card." (Abstract).

Although it is fairly obvious that it is critical to identify the plurality of components that are to be assembled in a transaction card prior to actually manufacturing the card, Goade, SR. fails to specifically teach this notion.

Borg teaches the following in regards to claim 34:

"It should be apparent that the testing of the electrical operation, and the verifying of the component identity and orientation prior to soldering the chip carrier 14 onto the printed circuit board 17 prevents or eliminates costly errors and rework. From station four, the printed circuit board 17 with the leadless chip carrier 14 mounted on it, moves on down the assembly line for other operations, as desired." (Col. 2, lines 40-47).

Although Borg's teachings are related to manufacturing a printed circuit board, the concept of verifying the component's identity before building the completed product is clear. Therefore in view of Borg's teachings it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to verify each component to be used in the manufacturing of a chip card before the card is put together. One would be motivated to verify each component before manufacturing the card in order to avoid errors in production.

***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Schnurmann (4,348,759), Hill et al (6,467,687), Bashan et al (6,719,206), and Warther et al (6,769,718).
7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to *Allyson N. Trail* whose telephone number is (571) 272-2406. The examiner can normally be reached between the hours of 7:30AM to 4:00PM Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee, can be reached on (571) 272-2398. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [\[allyson.trail@uspto.gov\]](mailto:allyson.trail@uspto.gov).

*All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.*

Allyson N. Trail  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2876  
June 21, 2005

*Jared J. Fureman*  
**JARED J. FUREMAN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**